Appln No. 09/641,987 Amdt date November 4, 2003 Reply to Office action of August 7, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application is hereby requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1 - 3, 6 - 18 and 20 are now in the application. Claims 4, 5 and 19 have been previously cancelled.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 - 3, 6 - 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Sano et al. in view of Jaskie et al. However, the Examiner has found that Claims 9 -17 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant's Claims 1 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) ... a plurality of spacers mounted within the cell such that the spacers are placed at a non-display area and extend substantially across the cell, the spacers being held between the faceplate and the backplate, wherein each of the plurality of spacers includes a plurality of exhaust grooves to enable fluid gas flow within the cell; ... a pair of alignment members connected to the spacers such that the spacers and alignment members form an integral spacer body, to align the spacers at the non-display area in a constant manner Similarly, Applicant's Claim 18 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) ... a plurality of spacers for mounting within a vacuum tight cell of a flat panel display such that the spacers are placed at a non-display area and extend substantially across the cell; ... a pair of alignment members connected to the spacers such that the spacers and alignment members form an Appln No. 09/641,987

Amdt date November 4, 2003

Reply to Office action of August 7, 2003

integral spacer body, to align the spacers at the non-display area in a constant manner, wherein each of the plurality of spacers includes a plurality of exhaust grooves to enable fluid gas flow within the cell; ... As such, the Applicant submits that the invention as claimed in Claims 1 and 18 are neither taught, described or suggested in Sano et al., even in view of Jaskie et al.

While Jaskie et al. may show side members 32 to define a central opening, Sano et al., merely shows first type barrier ribs 29 and second type barrier ribs 50 as an intersecting lattice of barrier ribs such that phosphors therewithin form respective R, G, B plasma display discharge spaces (cells). The Applicants submit that there is no suggestion to combine the teaching of Sano's phosphor bearing barrier rib lattice of cells with Jaskie's side members defining a central opening and result in a pair or alignment members connected to the spacers such that the spacers and alignment members form an integral spacer body, to align the spacers at the non-display area in a constant the Applicant believes that the Examiner manner. Further, appears to be inappropriately utilizing the teachings of plasma display panel cell formation and applying it to a field emission display type of flat panel display wherein emitters emit electrons to respective phosphors layers surrounded by black matrix areas, such emitters / phosphors / black matrix areas being within spacer confines of the integral spacer body, as can be seen in FIG. 1 of the present application..

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 18 are not unpatentable over Sano et al. in view of Jaskie et al.

Appln No. 09/641,987

Amdt date November 4, 2003

Reply to Office action of August 7, 2003

Claims 2, 3, 6 - 17 are dependent on Claim 1. Claim 20 is dependent on Claim 18. As such, these dependent claims are believed allowable based upon Claims 1 and 18 respectively.

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

Richard J. Faciulan

Reg. No. 28,248 626/795-9900

RJP/cah

CAH PAS534517.1-*-11/4/03 9:03 AM